

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the instant response. Claims 4, 8, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18 and 23 have been amended herein. Claims 1-23 remain pending in the case. No new matter has been added as a result of these amendments.

CLAIM REJECTIONS
35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 18 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 112, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Claims 18 and 23 have been amended herein, thereby obviating the rejection of Claims 18 and 23.

35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 3-9, and 11-16 are rejected under U.S.C 102(e) as being anticipated by US patent no. 6, 198, 696 issued to Korpi et al. (hereafter referred to as Korpi). Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 3-9, and 11-16 are not anticipated or suggested by Korpi.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 1 which recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to (emphasis added):

A method of management of time zone information in a calendar application, comprising:

- storing an event associated with a block of time;
- storing a time zone attribute associated with the event;
- establishing a display time zone for display of events;
- translating the block of time associated with the event from the stored time zone to the display time zone; and
- displaying the event as occurring at the translated block of time.

Independent Claim 10 recites a similar limitation. Claims 3-9 that depend from independent Claim 1, and Claims 11-16 that depend on independent Claim 10 provide further recitations of the features of the present invention.

Korpi and the claimed invention are very different. Applicants understand Korpi to teach a method for tracking time zone changes in communications devices. Korpi purports to teach that the reference time is based upon travel of the device (Column 5 lines 18-20). Furthermore, Korpi teaches the dynamic adjustment of the time-of-day clock will lead to a display of inaccurate time information if a user postpones a trip without updating the information in the itinerary of the memory (Column 5 lines 26-30). Korpi associates the reference time with an anticipated trip event (Column 5 lines 38-39). However, the claimed embodiments of the present invention do not associate the reference time with an anticipated event. In fact, Korpi actually teaches away from the claimed limitations of the present invention because with Korpi, the dynamic adjustment of the time-of-day clock will lead to a display of inaccurate time information if a

user postpones a trip without updating the information in the itinerary of the memory. Korpi uses planned events to modify the reference time. The claimed limitations of the present invention use a reference time that is independent of the planned events. In fact, the present invention uses a time zone attribute associated with the event to translate the stored event time to the displayed time. Thus, the claimed embodiments of the present invention will not display inaccurate time information if a user postpones a trip because the reference time is not based upon anticipated events.

Applicants respectfully assert that nowhere does Korpi teach, disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in independent Claims 1 and 10, and that these Claims are thus in a condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Korpi does not teach or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claims 3-9, which depend from independent Claim 1, and Claims 11-16, which depend from independent Claim 10. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 3-9 and 11-14 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and are in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Korpi in view of Pub No US 2003/0009411 issued to Ram et al

(hereafter referred to as Ram). Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 2 and 10 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Korpi in view of Ram.

As stated above, Korpi and the claimed invention are very different. Korpi actually teaches away from the claimed invention by associating the reference time with an anticipated travel event. Ram does not remedy the deficiencies in Korpi. In fact, Ram teaches transforming NASDAQ Level II data for any selected security, at any instant in time, into a format suitable for display on the grid-based graphical display (paragraph 0269). Applicants understand "grid-based" to refer to a grid-based computing environment (Abstract) and not to a daily time grid, as claimed.

Applicants respectfully assert that nowhere does the combination of Korpi and Ram teach, disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in Claims 2, or 10 and that these claims are thus in a condition for allowance.

Claims 17 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Korpi in view of US Pat No 6, 631, 402 issued to Devine et al (hereafter referred to as Devine). Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 17 and 19-22 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Korpi in view of Devine.

As stated above, Korpi and the claimed invention are very different. Korpi actually teaches away from the claimed invention by associating the reference time with an anticipated travel event. Devine does not remedy the deficiencies in Korpi. Devine may teach selection of a time zone by menu choice for establishing a report schedule (column 18 lines 21-25), but Devine fails to teach or suggest assigning a time zone attribute to an event, as claimed by the present invention.

Applicants respectfully assert that nowhere does the combination of Korpi and Devine teach, disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in Claims 17 and 19-22 and that these claims are thus in a condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION


In light of the above listed remarks, reconsideration of the amended Claims is requested. Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-20 overcome the rejections and objections of record and, therefore, allowance of Claims 1-20 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant response, the Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO L.L.P.

Dated: 1/27, 2004



Anthony Murabito
Registration No. 35,295

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060